DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 973 CS 502 689

AUTHOR Sharf, Barbara F.
TITLE Rhetorical Analysis of Non-Public Discourse.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 26p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Philadelphia, PA, May 5-7, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discourse Analysis; *Rhetoric; *Rhetorical Criticism; *Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

In arguing for a functional rather than contextual definition of rhetoric, this paper explains that an addressed audience and not a public setting is what makes the concept of "rhetorical quality" meaningful. The paper then notes that the defining characteristics of rhetorical quality are goal orientation and strategy, and it reasons that nonpublic discourse may be considered as if rhetorical. It next discusses the usefulness of treating nonpublic modes of communication rhetorically. Finally, it identifies conceptual and methodological issues related to this trend in rhetorical analysis in terms of extant literature and possible implications of future development. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC DISCOURSE

Barbara F. Sharf
Coordinator, Independent Study Program
Abraham Lincoln School of Medicine
University of Illinois Medical Center-Chicago

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Barbara F. Sharf

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS502 689

Identifying the Rhetorical

Communication and Rhetorical Quality

During the fervor of 1970, when all aspects of American life were undergoing radical shifts of consciousness, the Committee on the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical Criticism issued a report as part of the National Development Project on Rhetoric. One often-quoted recommendation from the report that reflected the era was that "rhetorical criticism must broaden its scope to examine the full range of rhetorical transactions: that is, informal conversations, group settings, mass media messages, picketing, sloganeering, chanting, singing, marching, gesturing, ritual, institutional and cultural symbols, cross cultural transactions and so forth."[2] In recent years, negative reactions to that suggestion show the hindsight of the intervening years. As an example of the opposition, Hart objects to "such a broad-based operational definition." He asserts that criticism which is based on deviations "from traditional, commonly shared understandings of what rhetoric is"[3] is a dangerous obstacle to theory-building.

Yet, there is a more important statement from the Committee, one that is both less dated by its context and less frequently remembered.

> Rhetorical criticism is to be identified by the kinds of questions posed by the critic. This position involves a shift in traditional emphases from identifying rhetorical criticism by material studied to identifying it by the nature of the critic's inquiry. . . . The critic becomes rhetorical to the extent that he studies his subject in terms of its suasory potential or persuasive effect. So identified, rhetorical criticism may be applied to any human act, process, product, or arti-

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC DISCOURSE

This essay makes an argument for a functional, rather than contextual, definition of rhetoric. It is explained that an addressed audience rather than a public setting is what makes the concept of "rhetorical quality" meaningful. The defining characteristics of rhetorical quality are goal-orientation and strategy. It is thus reasoned that non-public discourse may be considered as if rhetorical. The usefulness of treating non-public modes of communication rhetorically is discussed specifically. Conceptual and methodological issues related to this trend in rhetorical analysis are identified in terms of extant literature and possible implications of future development.

Despite the position taken a few years back that those in the field of speech-communication might be better off forsaking the quest for a once-and-for all definition of rhetoric[1], the problem of setting relatively stable parameters for the discipline remains—and probably for good reason. Without a clear conceptualization of what it is that rhetorical scholars are to be analyzing, criticizing, and drawing generalizations from, theory-building may well continue on a stilted and noncumulative course. Toward the end-goal of conceptual clarification that will aid theory-building and methodology, this essay will: (1) take the position that rhetoric can be viewed as a possible dimension of any symbolic action rather than a label for a particular type of symbolic act; (2) argue that, given the validity of such a position, non-public discourse, the informal communication of dyads and small groups, then becomes appropriate data for rhetorical study; and (3) point to changes in concept and methodology that stem from rhetorical study of non-public communication, but which may serve to vitalize any sort of rhetorical scholarship.

fact which, in the critic's view, may formulate, sustain, or modify attention, perceptions, attitudes, or behavior.[4]

In other words, the Committee points out that it is misleading and dysfunctional to conceive of rhetoric as a label for a particular type of symbolic act, thus negating the assumption, promulgated by Hart, that there exists a traditional, commonly shared interpretation of what species of talk or context is to be studied. Rather, a contemporary conception of rhetoric should embrace a particular discursive attribute or quality that is perceived by the rhetorical critic among many potentially functional dimensions inherent in symbolic action. The remainder of this essay supports the Committee's position. The specific extension of this argument is to acknowledge the utility of treating non-public discourse as if it were rhetorical, while considering the special circumstances a rhetorical critic will face in doing so.

By way of introducing this argument, it remains for me to describe more precisely what is meant by functionally rhetorical quality, be it in a public or non-public context. With notable reliance on familiar, contemporary theories, rhetorical quality is defined as that dimension of discursive acts that can be described as <u>inducing cooperation through the creation of a symbolic vision or reality in which others identify and participate.</u>[5]

One objection that might be raised against such a broad definition is that rhetorical quality, so defined, is not distinct from communication-in-general. It seems to me, however, that certain premises are implicit in this definition that do help to characterize rhetorical quality as a distinctive characteristic that is not universally apparent or salient in any and all communication. Rhetorical acts can be perceived as <u>goal-oriented</u>, that is, inducing the cooperation of others toward a specific end; and as <u>strategic</u>, insofar as the symbolic vision or reality is created with a conscious eye

toward adapting its form and content to the characteristics of others from whom identification or participation is desired.

The word "conscious" is a troublesome qualifier when conceived of in absolutist terms: that is, when an individual is said to be either conscious or unconscious. Phenomenologically-based communication theory explains "that consciousness is inherently consciousness-of, or that consciousness is intentional."[6] The process of human beings relating to one another, no matter what the communicative arena, is marked by shifting degrees of consciousness. The assumption operating here is that the greater the degree of intentionality of motivations, goals, and strategies operating within a relationship, the more the discourse can be said to be functioning and can be examined rhetorically. Another way of stating these premises is to assert that critics will have difficulty identifying a rhetorical dimension within communication that is haphazardly developed, that is not directed toward a specific end, and that is not addressed to a specific group of others.

The Public vs. Non-Public Controversy

Even with the qualifying premises made explicit in conjunction with the definition given above, the term "rhetorical quality" still encompasses a good deal of human communication. A search of the literature in contemporary rhetorical theory and criticism reveals that many, if not most, rhetorical scholars ascribe to the idea that there is a contextual differentia, as well: that is, rhetorical communication also must be public.

The association of rhetorical research with discourse that is public (commonly thought of as speech addressed by one individual to many), of course, has deep historical roots that can be traced from Greek society of the fourth

century B.C. to the present. In speech-communication departments throughout the country, "Rhetoric and Public Address" are lumped together as one subcategory of the broader field of communication. Contrastingly, the Speech Communication Association has seen fit to establish a division of rhetorical and communication theory and a separate division of public address. However, this categorization is rarely reflected in our discipline's literature. The great majority of speech fundamentals and public speaking texts that incorporate principles of rhetorical theory and criticism seem to indicate that a rhetorical perspective is useful only in a public address context. Representative of such books is the recent edition of Public Speaking as a Liberal Art, a long-enduring and popular text authored by two distinguished rhetorical scholars. Wilson and Arnold define public speaking as "any continuing utterance that occurs a rhetorical situation, functioning as a system specially dependent on a single communicator."[7] Thus, their emphasis is on a single, uninterrupted source of communication. Wilson and Arnold's reference to a rhetorical situation is taken directly from Bitzer's explanation.[8] The broad definition of a rhetorical situation as one consisting of exigencies, audience, and constraints has potential usefulness as a way of conceptualizing all types of interactions, private and public. Although Bitzer, himself, might have chosen a variety of contextual examples to illustrate his construct, he uses only those typical of public address, such as eulogies to John F. Kennedy, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and Franklin D. Roosevelt's Declaration of War.

Campbell cites the rhetoric of women's liberation as an unusual and distinct genre, one reason being that it rejects "certain traditional concepts of the rhetorical process—as persuasion of the many by an expert or leader. . . ."[9] She further explains that this genre uses non-customary devices such as consciousness raising groups[10] and publicizing-politicalizing of material

usually considered private and personal. However, she emphasizes the need for transcendence of accounts of individual experience to the more general level of conditions of women in this society: "unless such transcendence occurs, there is no persuasive campaign, no rhetoric in any public sense, only the very limited realm of therapeutic, small-group interaction."[11] Therefore, Campbell also alludes to the public nature of rhetoric and specifically sets aside "therapeutic, small-group interaction."

Perhaps most directed to the crux of this issue, Scott explicitly differentiates rhetoric as a sub-category of communication "characterized by a high degree of intentionality and a high degree of structure, including distinctiveness of communicative roles; it eventuates in discourse in the public realm of experience rather than the private." By using the public-private dichotomy to define rhetoric, his point of reference is, once again, contextual. He goes on to explain that "publicness" indicates a rhetor's initiative, as well as "the bindingness that comes from intentional statements before witnesses."[12] However, Scott acknowledges that "publicness" is being used in the broad, Burkean sense that rhetoric is "addressed,"[13] a phrase that stimulates an audience. Here is where the confusion sets in, for the significance of "rhetoric as addressed" is functional, not contextual.

A major problem with using the quality of "publicness" as a characteristic trait of rhetorical acts is that there is no specification of how extensive or accessible an addressed audience should be. Therefore, to define rhetoric as public talk is not always a helpful criterion to the would-be critic. In an extreme sense, rhetorical acts even might be "addressed" to oneself; for example, convincing oneself that it is the proper time to be courageous and ask the boss for a raise. Under usual circumstances, to be addressed implies the presence of at least "an other"; thus, speech technically might be

described as public if it is addressed to one, two, seven, or five hundred. It would appear, then, that a reliance on a public context as a way of distinguishing rhetoric is fraught with an ambiguity that confounds rather than clarifies. On the other hand, the concept of an addressed audience, when taken from a functional perspective, becomes extremely important to an understanding of rhetorical quality. It is the connections between speaker and listener, or between persons who are alternately speakers and listeners—why they have come together, what they seek to obtain from one another, how each perceives the other—that will shape goals and generate symbolic strategies. Any communication requires some notion of audience, but a specifically addressed audience implies the sense of rhetorical quality defined here.

It should be noted that on practical, rather than theoretical, grounds there are at least two good reasons why studies in the history and criticism of rhetoric have tended to focus on public address. First of all, public discourse is easily accessible and often is recorded in writing, on tape or film, thus facilitating the job of data collection for the researcher. Secondly, discourse communicated in public is usually uninterrupted, pre-planned, and coherently organized, all of which certainly aids the tasks of analysis and evaluation.

Nevertheless, in the face of such pragmatic concerns and the well articulated positions favoring rhetoric as public discourse, I assert that these arguments are insufficient to warrant the conclusion that acts treated rhetorically necessarily be public. Instead I offer the counter-argument that some small group and dyadic interaction also may be usefully perceived as functioning rhetorically, despite the lack of what most would consider to be a public quality. Although traditional practice would lead one to believe otherwise, in accordance with the definition of rhetorical quality cited above,

it should not be significant to the rhetorical critic whether the discourse under examination is considered to take place in a public or private context. What is crucial is whether it can be argued plausibly that the talk induces cooperation through the creation of a symbolic vision. For example, Phillips and Metzger explain "that the kind of talk associated with intimate relationships is a rhetorical exchange, in which both parties to the relationship attempt to manage the other in order to achieve personal goals."[14]

However, to comprehend rhetorical quality as operational in a larger discursive range or in more contexts than are usually acknowledged is no simple matter. To make such a claim is also to introduce many complications into the work of the rhetorical scholar who attempts to describe, interpret, and/or evaluate talk that is non-public. While the discourse may be described as functioning rhetorically, tried and true rhetorical methods and constructs may prove unsatisfactory in understanding how that dimension operates in a given case. Obviously, discourse that can be labeled as "informal conversations" (as did the Committee in the aforementioned quotation) or "non-public" interaction manifests itself in ways quite different from public address. Those present in such communicative contexts are the verbalizing participants, as well as perhaps a limited number of non-verbalizing, invited bystanders: the participants assume active roles in both speaking and listening: the number of participants is usually limited to dyads or small groups: and the talk generated tends to be relatively spontaneous, free-flowing, and multi-directional. Traditional conceptualizations that are speaker-centered, posit stable role behaviors for speaker and audience, conceive of persuasive ends in a limited sense, and ignore relational aspects of interpersonal influence can no longer serve as adequate and sufficient explanatory frameworks for rhetorical analysis.

There can be little doubt that the informal conversation in which nearly all human beings take part every day of their lives provides rich substance for the study of symbolic influence. Not context, but function, determines whether rhetorical quality can be an identifiable aspect of such substance. Specific applications of this supposition will be cited in the subsequent discussion. However, as the rhetorical analyst ventures from the well-ordered world of the "public" arena to a new environment characterized by unplanned interruptions, distracting tangents, jumbled organization, and rapidly exchanged roles, new critical methodologies and perspectives must be added to those already in use.

Rhetorical Transactions

One consequence of making informal interaction data the focus of rhetorical analysis is that critics will have to instill the notion of transaction in their work. Stewart says of the transactional perspective: "Every time persons communicate, they are continually offering definitions of themselves and responding to definitions of the other(s) which they perceive. . . . In other words, a transaction is an event in which who we are (our 'existence and nature') emerges out of the event itself."[15] If the critic views a conversational exchange as a rhetorical situation, there cannot be a narrow or rigid speaker-audience orientation. Each communicator uses and responds to symbols based on his or her own agendas and purposes. Thus, every participant in the communication is, at least potentially, a rhetor. A recognition of multi-speaker/listener persuasive phenomena requires the critic to be able to view the rhetor-audience relationship as a shifting one and changes the center of attention from the sources of communication to the messages communicated, the meanings evoked, and the relationships evolved.

In a recent statement, Scott provides a different indication as to how the rhetorical critic might build the idea of transaction in the understanding of persuasivediscourse. He takes a new approach to rhetorical processes by highlighting the listener as a shaper of meaning and asking what it means to be persuaded. The question is posed: "How do we open, or refuse to open, ourselves to persuasion? What are our sources and resources as persons who have developed loyalties to institutions, roles, and values of our associations?"[16] Scott urges that attempts be made "to understand the patterns of persuasion one is a part of, not simply as initiators with some preconceived projects to influence the decisions of others but as constant interpreters of messages."[17] Thus, another way of understanding rhetorical actions as transactional is to give critical attention to the role of listener(s) as well as that of speaker(s), to view communicative meaning, in the language of symbolic interactionists, as conjoint response. The continuously changing roles inherent in non-public discourse especially require the rhetorical critic to adopt this stance.

Another facet of conversational data to be taken into account by the critic concerned with transaction is the notion of co-existent sets of rhetorical actions. As stated previously, each participant is a rhetor, responding to the situational elements with unique symbolic choices. These co-existing sets of rhetorical actions may be complementary, that is, functioning to achieve mutual goals. More often, and perhaps more interestingly, they are competing, intended to achieve conflicting goals. For instance, certain members of any small group each will generate discourse to influence the other members in order to gain support for the leadership position.[18] Therapists try verbally to encourage clients to alter attitudes and behaviors; clients often respond with talk of resistance and opposition.[19] Now, the responsibilities of the rhetorical critic become more complex. The transactional nature of non-public discourse

demands that the analyst be attuned to the probability of numerous, separately created rhetorical efforts.

Reconceptualizing the Ends of Rhetorical Acts

In addition to conceiving of rhetorical acts as transactional, other conceptual changes on the part of the critic may be in order. If they are to be comfortable with the idea of rhetorical quality inherent in non-public discourse, critics need an expanded sense of the possible ends of interpersonal influence. The Aristotelian notion that rhetoric refers to "discovering the available means of persuasion"[20] is still a viable one; however, it is an observation that grew out of and has been applied chiefly to public address situations. Contemporary statements that delineate rhetorical objectives do not negate Aristotle's definition, but help to carry its significance into contexts upon which he had not focused. They do so by expanding our sense of rhetoric.

For example, Burke has chosen the phrase "inducing cooperation."[21] Certainly, inducing cooperation through symbolic means requires one to discover the available resources of persuasion in a given case. However, for many people, the former is a more flexible term that covers a greater range of rhetorical situations and interpersonal objectives, public and private. One might induce the cooperation of an other to pay attention to what one has to say, without attempting to persuade the other of a specific change in belief or additional behavior. As Burke wrily indicates, symbol-using beings even cooperate in order to engage in conflict.[22] Similarly, Rosenfield, Hayes, and Frentz define the end-goal or telos of "rhetoric games" as consensus among the participants.[23] Whereas the Burkean phraseology still may suggest one person is acting upon another, the notion of consensus comes closer to the trans-

actional image of people acting together or at least simultaneously. However, the emphasis on telos seems misplaced. The importance of depicting rhetoric as consensus stems from the symbolic acts of coming together, the process of reaching agreement rather than the agreement, itself.

Phillips and Metzger also attempt a transactional depiction that incorporates the idea of concurrent, competing or complementary, rhetorical actions. Emphasizing the reciprocal influence that is basic to "interpersonal rhetoric," they state that "rhetoric . . . refers to symbolic communication made by one person, directed at another person, in order to accomplish some goal. . . . Rhetoric is represented in interpersonal terms by the role played, the reward offered, and the exchange proposition submitted, as well as the discourse about the medium of exchange."[24] Thus, Phillips and Metzger begin to identify resources withina rhetorical situation that are related to the traditional "available means" of ethos, pathos, and logos, but which are far more rooted in the dynamics of interpersonal relationships than Aristotle had ever conceived.

In short, rhetorical quality remains characterized as persuasive. What is subject to reconceptualization is how persuasion is employed interpersonally, to what ends. Achieving cooperation or consensus, establishing an interpersonal exchange for mutual goal attainment, attracting and maintaining attention are all examples of interpersonal functions that require persuasive means and can be identified in any context.

Relational Rhetorical Acts

There is another major alteration in traditional treatments of rhetoric that will need to be considered in bringing critical methodology to bear in non-public contexts. In explaining the pragmatics of human communication,

Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson pointed out what now seems obvious: there is a content and relationship dimension—what is said and how it is said—in communication. The relationship level is meta-communication in that it aids the participants or observers in putting the content messages into the perspective of the feelings and role relationships being evolved, thereby developing additional shades of meaning. Both dimensions must be taken into account if one wishes a fuller understanding of any communicative transaction,[25] including the rhetorical level.

Rhetorical theory and criticism have done little with the idea of the relationship dimension. A few critics refer to "tone," as that elusive quality in a public address that connotes the speaker's relationship to the audience.[26] Besides the fact that this usage is clearly non-transactional, the concept also is not given much emphasis by most rhetoricians. Rather, content or substance is usually given primary consideration in rhetorical analyses. What are the arguments or propositions being developed, in what ways are the arguments being supported, how are the arguments arranged and what are the interrelationships among them? What are the value premises underlying the major arguments and how do they pertain to the values of the audience(s)? These are basic points of traditional critical inquiry (of course, many others could be mentioned, as well). Naturally, stylistic issues are taken into account—matters of phrasing, imagery, humor, etc.—but mostly in reference to how they advance or detract from the ideas being asserted. Thus far, the relationship level of communication has not been regarded as a proper or important subject for rhetorical inquiry, perhaps because of the nature of public contexts.

On the other hand, if one considers much of the talk that takes place in small groups and dyads, often participants (and observers) are intuitively

attuned to the relationship cues communicated. As Rosenfield, Hayes, and Frents reiterate, the "saying" is often more important than the "said."[27] That is, the substantive ideas exchanged in informal conversation may appear to be trivial, undeveloped, or weakly supported: a colorful illustration is the incessant squabbling by many marital partners over how money is spent. The fact that the content dimension flounders does not mean that nothing significant is taking place rhetorically. The bickering couple may do little to settle or improve their financial differences, but during their fights they are working very hard at symbolically managing their relationship. Whether the arguments have to do with money, child rearing, or sex, a rhetorical analysis of discourse generated between conflicting spouses should have the potential to indicate how interpersonal influence is attained, maintained, and/or exchanged. Similarly, in a therapeutic transaction, relationship issues are essential to persuasive ends. Says family therapist Jay Haley: "It is of crucial importance that the therapist deal successfully with the question whether he or the patient is to control what kind of relationship they will have. . . . It becomes necessary to consider the tactics which a person can use to gain control of the relationship with another person and therefore influence his emotions and somatic sensations."[28] The problem is that many of the fundamental issues usually raised by rhetoricians—critical inquiries having to do with arguments or propositions and modes of support—lead to little or no insight about relational rhetoric. New critical frameworks geared toward understanding the strategies used in defining human relationships must be found. One promising start in this direction is the methodology of fantasy theme analysis.[29] By identifying fantasies that have chained out to function as a rhetorical vision for a group or organization, the critic can say something about the interpersonal tensions that have not been dealt with directly and the mutually

enjoyed dramas that aid feelings of cohesiveness. Nonetheless, the understanding of relationship issues is not the major thrust of fantasy theme analysis, nor does this methodology yield a full explanation of relational rhetoric.

Changing Methodologies

It is becoming clear that reconceptualization of rhetorical acts to include non-public discourse also necessitates changes in research and critical methodology for rhetoricians. Current critical/analytical frameworks that have been used in the explanation and evaluation of public address need to be tested to find which can be adapted to a transactional perspective and conversational conventions. A prime example are the constructs of rhetorical campaigns and movements. Chesebro and Hamsher cite these same concepts as dimensions of a new, contemporary rhetoric, promising ways of achieving a gestalt perspective and the formation of genres.[30] They are transactional insofar as they allow the critic to account for co-existing rhetorical actions (new movements versus the status quo) through time. On the other hand, campaigns and movements have been conceived of in linear, chronologically order stages, a characteristic that may be antithetical to a true gestalt, processual point of view. Indeed, critics may have to work hard to cut aside the tendency to think linearly in order to conceive of stages of a rhetorical campaign that may be partially overlapping or entirely concurrent, that jump back and forth in prominence and time.

Nonetheless, almost all contemporary critical approaches have emerged from studies of public discourse. Many of these will not be directly applicable to non-public communication and new rhetorical methodologies will have to be

created in order to better understand the material being examined. One strong possibility is that as the rhetorical critic struggles to make sense of unruly interaction patterns, methodologies will be suggested by the nature of the data under examination. Scott and Brock describe an experiential trend in criticism in which the critic does not impose a pre-formulated framework. The experiential critic recognizes that "discourse is part of an ever-shifting reality," that rhetorical acts may be studied from an infinite number of perspectives, and that all criticism is arbitrary and subjective. Thus, experiential criticism is admittedly tentative, and focused on issues that arise from the interaction between the critic and the communicative acts. Modes of analysis that develop out of the critic-act relationship will be eclectic, drawing upon whatever combination of theories or constructs can lead to insights about the rhetorical dimension.[31] They also will begin as idiosyncratic frameworks for the specific interaction data from which they evolve, but the most successful methodologies will have the potential to be used with other similar sets of data.

An experiential approach in methodology has implications for rhetorical theory-building, as well. Sociologists Glaser and Strauss describe a methodological strategy for qualitative research that resembles experiential criticism in its emphasis on the researcher's undirected encounter with the data. Performing constant comparisons among a number of case studies leads to the formulation of qualitative observations, substantive and formal, about particular patterns of human interaction. The end result of such research is a series of related hypotheses or a theory grounded in specific data.[32] The grounded theory method stresses the importance of generating, as well as verifying, theory, a task that Bowers has called the "pre-scientific function" of rhetoric.[33] Directing their attentions to communicative contexts previously

ignored will stimulate rhetorical critics to produce creative methodologies and original contributions to theory. Hart and Burks' construct "rhetorical sensitivity,"[34] a pioneering effort at delineating the interface between rhetorical processes and interpersonal communication is a fine case in point of a theoretical contribution, though it has not yet been applied extensively as a critical tool.

Of course, there are other methodological options for rhetorical analysis of non-public discourse, in addition to traditional and experiential perspectives. Critical methodology may be enhanced by an infusion of ideas from the social sciences. This seems a natural direction for critism to take, as rhetoricians begin to study the same sorts of phenomena as communicologists and other social scientists. The insights of non-rhetorical thinkers may prove to be useful in shaping organizing principles for rhetorical acts.

A variety of promising illustrations of rhetorical-behavioral concepts already exist. Bormann's notions of fantasy theme and rhetorical vision are derived from Bales' work in small group interaction analysis. He shows how fantasies may "chain out" among group members and cluster into rhetorical visions that serve as the group's social reality. Through fantasies, tensions are played out symbolically and feelings of cohesiveness are enhanced. This work makes a strong argument for rhetoricians to examine socioemotional aspects of group discussion.[35] Two recent works rely heavily on the principles and practices of the symbolic interactionists. Using what they call a "language-action paradigm," Frentz and Farrell provide a conceptual-structural framework for the analysis of interpersonal communication. Their accompanying illustration describes and evaluates strategic choices of communicators in light of "encounter rules" extrapolated from conversational materials.[36] As with traditional rhetorical criticism, the language-action approach is inter-

pretative and judgmental, however non-rhetorical notions are synthesized to provide a basis for interpretation and criteria for judgment. Rosenfield, Hayes, and Frentz have developed a "game-play" model applicable to all forms of communication, public and interpersonal. Drawing from game theory, the game perspective accounts for the structure and creativity of human interaction, while the play notion emphasizes the dramatic nature of communication and meaning through conjoint response.[37] Glaser creates an original research tool by combining Bitzer's concept of rhetorical exigency with Homan's Social Exchange Theory. In her analysis of communication between intimates, she evaluates how well partners respond rhetorically to one another's "perceived interpersonal exigencies" through established interaction patterns and to what degree these responses are reciprocal.[38] Unlike experiential methodologies, all these modes of analysis were devised prior to the critical examination of data. What they share in common is the innovative incorporation of theory from the behavioral sciences to enrich understanding of rhetorical quality inherent in non-public discourse.

The enumeration of examples may appear to be proof of ample work with non-public discourse already begun. It must be cautioned that while these illustrations are promising evidence that this is a viable direction for rhetorical critics to take, the relatively limited existing writings are still in the formative stages. With the exception of fantasy theme analysis (thus far, used most often in the criticism of public discourse[39]) no follow-up studies have been done. In short, there are still very few working models of how one goes about rhetorically analyzing non-public discourse.

Changing the Rhetorician

To summarize thus far, a functionally-based definition of rhetoric provides the possibility of considering non-public discourse as if it were rhetorical. To do so deepens our understanding of interpersonal influence and rhetorical process in general, both vitalizing and extending the long established roots of rhetorical criticism. Such change in the focus of scholarly activity necessitates conceptual and methodological explorations as have been described. One final phenomena that may grow out of rhetorical analysis of non-public discourse is a transformation in how the rhetorical scholar and critic is perceived by self and others.

In the first place, critics will find themselves bringing rhetorical thinking to bear in places where it has not been used before. As rhetoricians contribute to the understanding of interpersonal communication, their scholarly works will gain a broader readership, both in the humanities and the social sciences. Unexpectedly, rhetorical critics may find colleagueship emanating from previously ignored academic quarters.

Secondly, not only academicians, but communication practitioners may be affected by insights gained through rhetorical analyses. Given the appropriate diffusion of research results, rhetorical criticism may find that their work can be used in applied, pragmatic ways, a phenomenon that has occurred very infrequently with rhetorical criticism of public discourse. Therapists, teachers, organizational decison-makers, and families, to name a few examples, may learn a great deal when they can begin to see their relationships through such conceptual lenses as persuasive campaigns, strategic language choice, rhetorical sensitivity, and argumentative construction. It is not implausible to conceive of rhetorical criticism used as one of the variety of communication education methods now

offered to spouses and families, as a portion of the training given to those in human services professions, and as a form of consultation in organization development efforts. Theory-building and criticism are the primary concerns of rhetorical scholarship, but contributions to applied research, surprisingly, may not be outside its purview either.

In short, the many professions and academic disciplines that deal with non-public modes of discourse stand to benefit greatly from the unique perspective of the rhetorical analyst. Another way of stating this idea is to say that the influence of rhetorical scholarship would be increased. It is as important to note, however, that rhetorical analysis of interaction data also enriches rhetorical theory and criticism, both conceptually and methodologically, and redirects the attention and skills of rhetoricians toward the non-public contexts in which a majority of today's talk takes place.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Robert L. Scott, "On Not Defining 'Rhetoric'," Philosophy and Rhetoric 6 (1973), 81-95.

[2]Thomas O. Sloan, Richard B. Gregg, Thomas R. Nilsen, Irving J. Rein, Herbert W. Simons, Hermann G. Stelzner, and Donald W. Zacharias, "Report of the Committee on the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical Criticism," in The Prospect of Rhetoric, ed. Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 225.

[3]Roderick P. Hart, "Theory-Building and Rhetorical Criticism: An Informal Statement of Opinion," Central States Speech Journal 27 (1976), 71.

[4]Sloan, Gregg, Nilsen, Rein, Simons, Stelzner, and Zacharias, p. 220.

[5]Key terms and concepts in this definition have been adapted from two sources. See: Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1969), pp. 1-46 for an explanation of "cooperation" and "identification," and Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," Quarterly Journal of Speech 58 (1972), 396-407 for an explanation of "symbolic vision" and "participation." It could be argued that a rhetorical goal might be to alienate an audience, but in so doing a rhetor simultaneously invites the identification and participation of another audience. For instance, the discourse of Nazi Frank Collin served to anger the residents of Skokie, Illinois and offended many people elsewhere, but it most certainly created a unifying symbolic vision for the National Socialist Party of America.

[6]John Stewart, "Foundations of Dialogic Communication," Quarterly Journal of Speech 64 (1978), 187.

[7]John F. Wilson and Carroll C. Arnold, Public Speaking as a Liberal Art, 3rd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974), p. vii.

[8]Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," Philosophy and Rhetoric 1 (1968), 1-14.

[9]Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," Quarterly Journal of Speech 59 (1973), 78.

[10]For a more detailed analysis of rhetorical quality occurring in consciousness raising groups, see: James W. Chesebro, John F. Cragan, and Patricia McCullough, "The Small Group Techniques of the Radical Revolutionary: A Synthetic Study of Consciousness Raising," Speech Monographs 40 (1973), 136-146.

[11]Campbell, p.4. Underlining is my own.

[12]Robert L. Scott, "A Synoptic View of Systems of Western Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech 61 (1975), 440. Additional explanation was obtained from: Robert L. Scott, "Rhetorical Criticism: The Experiential Perspective," unpublished lecture notes, University of Minnesota, 1974.

[13]Burke, pp. 37-39.

[14]Gerald M. Phillips and Nancy J. Metzger, Intimate Communication (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976), p. 6.

[15]John Stewart, Bridges Not Walls: A Book About Interpersonal Communication, 2nd ed. (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., 1977), p. 14.

[16]Robert L. Scott, "The Tacit Dimension and Rhetoric," paper presented to the Polyani Society at the Convention of the American Philosophic Association, Chicago, 1977, 9.

[17]Ibid. The roots for this position may be traced to Aristotle's con-

ception of enthymeme in which the audience "transacts" with rhetor by supplying the unspoken portion of an argument. Scott seems to be working from a more open-ended perspective. The listener role in "patterns of persuasion" may include interpretation of example as well as enthymeme, and of non-verbal as well as verbal messages.

[18]Barbara F. Sharf, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Leadership Emergence in Small Groups," Communication Monographs 45 (1978), 156-172.

[19]Barbara F. Sharf, "Qualitative Analysis of Marriage Counseling Communication," paper presented at the Convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, 1978.

[20]Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960), Book 1, Section1, p. 6.

[21]Burke, p. 43.

[22]Ibid., p. 22.

[23]Lawrence Rosenfield, Laurie Hayes, and Thomas Frentz, The Communicative Experience (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976), p. 298.

[24]Phillips and Metzger, p. 40.

[25]Paul Watzlawick, Janet H. Beavin, and Don D. Jackson, Pragmatics of Human Communication: A Study of Interaction Patterns, Pathologies, and Paradoxes (New York: Norton Publishing Co., 1967), pp. 51-54, 87-93.

[26]Robert L. Scott, The Speaker's Reader: Concepts in Communication (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1969), pp. 188-189. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, Critiques of Contemporary Rhetoric (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1972), p. 15.

[27]Rosenfield, Hayes, and Frentz, p. 94.

[28]Jay Haley, Strategies of Psychotherapy (New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1963), p. 19.

[29]Borsann, 396-407.

[30]James W. Chesebro and Carolin D. Hausher, "Contemporary Rhetorical Theory and Criticism: Dimensions of the New Rhetoric," Speech Monographs 42 (1975), 322-323.

[31]Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock, Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 125-126.

[32]Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967), pp. 1-158.

[33]John Waite Bowers, "The Pre-Scientific Function of Rhetorical Criticism," in Essays in Rhetorical Criticism, ed. Thomas R. Nilsen (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 126-145.

[34]Roderick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction." Speech Monographs 39 (1972), 75-91.

[35]Borsann, 396-407.

[36]Thomas S. Frentz and Thomas P. Farrell, "Language-Action: A Paradigm for Communication," Quarterly Journal of Speech 62 (1976), 333-349.

[37]Rosenfield, Hayes, and Frentz, pp. 27-59.

[38]Susan R. Glaser, "Can Rhetorical Criticism Be Used To Explain Talk Between Intimates?" Master's Thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1974.

[39]Sonja K. Foss, "The Fantasy Theme Analysis Approach to the Rhetorical Criticism of Social Movements: An Evaluation," paper presented at the Convention of the Western Speech Communication Association, Phoenix, 1977.